

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2&3. **Claims 1, 2, 9, 11, and 17** stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Eggert et al. (US 6,443,735). Applicant traverses this rejection and requests reconsideration in light of the claim amendments, if any, and the remarks set forth below.

Applicant hereby antedates the new subject matter disclosed in Eggert et al., as Eggert et al. has a filing date of 25 April 2000, while the present application claims provisional priority to U.S. Provisional Patent Application Ser. No. 60/162,308 filed 28 October 1999. Applicant notes that Eggert et al. is a **continuation-in-part** of U.S. Pat. No. 6,193,519, which is a continuation of U.S. Pat. No. 5,853,292 and notes that Applicant cannot antedate the parent applications, but can antedate the new subject matter disclosed in the cited Eggert et al. patent (US 6,443,735). Therefore, Applicant is directing his comments to the teaching of U.S. Pat. No. 6,193,519 ("**Eggert et al. 519**").

Eggert et al. 519 teaches an educational system that produces body sounds relative to placement of virtual medical devices proximate a sensor. The sensors, once activated, complete circuits that notify a computer to act a certain defined manner. Body sounds are generated by an audio chip, amplified and supplied to a speaker for the production of sound. Although **Eggert et al. 519** does include a tactile switch; the switch is associated with "a BP cuff 18d, a pulse oximeter finger cuff 18e" of the **Eggert et al. 519** system. The tactile switches are not tactile output devices designed to generate a pulse detectable to a user's touch. Moreover, **Eggert et al. 519** does not disclose correlated heart sounds able to be heard through a normal stethoscope and a pulse capable of being felt by touch so that the heart sounds and pulse are time to exactly correspond to what a doctor or medical student would hear and feel when treating a patient.

Because **Eggert et al. 519** does not disclose at least one tactile output devices capable to producing a realistically feeling pulse whether the pulse is associated with a health person or evidence some pathology, such as arterial blockage on one side of the body and does not correlate body sounds with tactile bodily response, **Eggert et al. 519** cannot anticipate the

present invention. Applicants, therefore, respectfully requests withdrawal of this section 102(e) rejection.


11. Claims 8, 10, 12-16, and 18-24 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eggert et al. in view of Takashina et al. (US 6,461,165). Applicant traverses this rejection and requests reconsideration in light of the claim amendments, if any, and the remarks set forth above and below.

As stated above, Applicant antedates Eggert et al. based on its provisional priority. Because the parent application **Eggert et al. 519** does not disclose, teach or even suggest, at least one tactile output device or correlated heart sounds and simulated pulse responses, **Eggert et al. 519** even combined with Takashina et al. does not render the present invention obvious. Applicants, therefore, respectfully requests withdrawal of this section 103(a) rejection.

If it would be of assistance in resolving any issues in this application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact applicant's attorney Robert W. Strozier at 713.977.7000

Date: **March 6, 2003**

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Robert W. Strozier', is written over a horizontal line.

Robert W. Strozier

Reg. No. 34,024